UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JOSEPH VIVIANI, et. al.,)	
	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 2:10-cv-01445-LRH-GWF
VS.	}	ORDER
JAMES W. VAHEY, et. al.,		Motion for Extension and Motion for Order to Serve by Publication (#13)
	Defendants.	(

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application to Extend Time for Service of Summons and Complaint and Motion for Order for Service by Publication (#13), filed December 23, 2010.

Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(e), service of summons by publication is governed by the state statutes of the state in which the District Court is located. Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(1)(i) states that the court may permit service by publication if, after due diligence shown, the plaintiffs are unable to find the defendant within the state or defendant is shown to be avoiding the service of summons. The plaintiffs must prove this to the satisfaction of the court either by affidavit or by a verified complaint. The question of due diligence is within the Court's discretion as there is no objective, formulaic standard for determining what is, or is not, due diligence under Nevada law. *Abreu* v. *Gilmer*, 985 P.2d 746, 749 (1999).

Plaintiffs have shown by their motion and affidavit that they have been unable to serve

Defendant Mary Muso after numerous attempts at service at the address on record for her with the Clark

County Assessor's Office. (#13). The Court finds that Plaintiffs have demonstrated due diligence in

attempting service that would warrant permitting service by publication. Accordingly,

1	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application to Extend Time for Service			
2	of Summons and Complaint and Motion for Order for Service by Publication (#13) is granted .			
3	Defendant Mary Muso may be served by Plaintiffs through publication of the summons and complaint			
4	in this case at least once a week for four (4) consecutive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation			
5	published in the Las Vegas-Henderson, Nevada metropolitan area.			
6	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs shall have until May 25, 2011, to complete			
7	service upon Defendant Mary Muso.			
8	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that absent compelling circumstances and a strong showing of			
9	good cause, no further extensions will be allowed.			
10	DATED this 25th day of January, 2011.			
11	\mathcal{U}			
12	GEORGE FOLEY, JR.			
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				